APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,476	04/06/2001	Motoki Ide	P/2291-100	6147

7590   07/31/2006

Steven I. Weisburd
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of Americas
41st floor
New York, NY 10036-2714

EXAMINER
HUYNH, THU V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/827,476	IDE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thu V. Huynh	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 May 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: RCE file on 5/03/06 to application filed on

04/06/01, which has priority of provisional filed on 04/07/00.

2.   Claims 1, 7 and 10 are currently amended.

3.   Claims 1-13 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims.

4.   All the rejections in the previous office action have been withdrawn as necessitated by

the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

     Regarding dependent claim 1, the limitation of "for displaying an obtained content based

on the displaying information on the display section" renders the claim is vague and indefinite,

since it produce incomplete phrase.

     Dependent claims 2-6 are rejected for fully incorporating the dependencies of their base.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9.   **Claims 1-2, 5, 7, 10, 13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Colson et al., US 6,708,217 B1, filed 01/05/00, in view of Gupta et al., US

6,622,171 B2, filed 09/15/98.

Regarding independent claim 1, Colson teaches:

-       a display section (Colson, fig.2, client computer 204 with display area);

-       a content obtainer for obtaining content data from a desired content server via a

network in an unknown information description language (Colson, col.1, lines 35-47;

col.7, lines 30-44; obtaining a document from a server using demultiplexer, wherein

the document is able to be an HTML or XML content);

-       a content-type discriminator for discriminating an information description language of

the obtained content data from a plurality of predetermined content types (Colson,

col.7, line 45 – col.8, line 15; determining an information description language of the

document, such as "HTML text" from plurality of predetermined content types, such

as content type "text/ascii" is ASCII text, "text/html" is HTML text, etc. using the

demultiplexer);

-       a plurality of parsers corresponding to respective ones of the plurality of predetermined

content types, wherein the obtained content data is parsed by a corresponding parser

depending on a discrimination information description language thereof to produce

displaying information (Colson, col.1, lines 35-47; col.7, line 47 – col.8, line 15;

plurality of parsers, such as HTML, XML processors corresponding to respective ones

of plurality of the predetermined content types are used to parse the document to

produce display information); and

- displaying an obtained content based on the displaying information on the display

    section (Colson, col.1, lines 35-47, the document (HTML or XML) must be parsed to

    display the document).

However, Colson does not explicitly disclose However, Colson does not explicitly disclose

the demultiplexer is included in the client computer.

Gupta teaches terminal device include a demultiplexer to distribute appropriate content to

appropriate rendering components to render the content (Gupta, figure 3; col.7, line 62 – col.8,

line 2; client computer 102 includes demultiplexer component 104).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Gupta's teaching and Colson's teaching to include a

demultiplexer in the client device, since the combination would have provide different options to

implement the demultiplexer, such as demultiplexer may be "added to an existing proxy or router

host", "implemented as stand-alone component" (Colson, col.7, lines 9-17), or incorporated into

the client device (Gupta, figures 1-2, [0023]; Demultiplexer 160 in client device 102).

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1. Colson teaches the plurality of

predetermined content types are determined by respective ones of the information description

languages having no compatibility with each other (Colson, col.1, lines 35-47; col.7, line 47 –

col.8, line 15).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Colson teaches wherein the content-

type discriminator discriminates a content type of the obtained content data by refereeing to a

content-type indicating code included in a protocol header of the obtained content data (Colson,

col.2, lines 4-57, col.8, lines 45-67; searching the boundary string followed by a "content-type:"

entry in the header of the document).

Regarding independent claim 7, Colson teaches the steps of:

a) obtaining content data from a desired content server via a network having an unknown

information description language (Colson, col.1, lines 35-47; obtaining a document

from a server, wherein the document is able to be an HTML or XML content);

b) discriminating an information description language of the obtained content data from a

plurality of predetermined content types (Colson, col.7, line 47 – col.8, line 15;

determining an information description language of the document, such as "HTML

text" from plurality of predetermined content types, such as content type "text/ascii" is

ASCII text, "text/html" is HTML text, etc.);

c) parsing the obtained content data depending on a discrimination result of the step (b) to

produce displaying information (Colson, col.1, lines 41-47, col.9, lines 1-6; the content

registry using the content type retrieved to send the content (document) to

corresponding content renders capable of rendering that document); and

    d) displaying an obtained content based on the display information (Colson, col.1, lines

41-47, col.9, lines 1-6).

However, Colson does not explicitly disclose the demultiplexer is included in the client

Computer.

Gupta teaches terminal device include a demultiplexer to distribute appropriate content to

appropriate rendering components to render the content (Gupta, figures 1-2; [0023], [0030]-

[0031]; client computer 102 includes display area 104 and demultiplexer 160).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Gupta's teaching and Colson's teaching to include a

demultiplexer in the client device, since the combination would have provide different options to

implement the demultiplexer, such as demultiplexer may be "added to an existing proxy or router

host", "implemented as stand-alone component" (Colson, col.7, lines 9-17), or incorporated into

the client device (Gupta, figures 1-2, [0023]; Demultiplexer 160 in client device 102).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Colson teaches wherein said

discriminating step comprises the steps of:

    b.1)   storing a plurality of unique codes each indicating the plurality of predetermined

content types (Colson, figures 3-4; col.7, line 47 – col.8, line 15; col.9, lines 11-12,

lookup content type in mapping registry);

    b.2)   checking a code arranged at a predetermined location or the obtained content data to

determine whether the code is text data (Colson, fig.4, col.2, lines 4-57; col.8, lines

45-67; col.9, lines 11-12, searching a boundary string follow by a "Content-type:"

entry to discriminate the content type of the document for "text/html" or

"audio/wav");

b.3)   when it is determined that the code is not text data, searching the plurality of unique

codes for a code arrange at a predetermined location of the obtained content data to

discriminated the content type of the obtained content data (Colson, figures 3-4;

col.7, line 47 – col.8, line 15; col.9, lines 11-12, lookup content type in mapping

registry for a content type of the document in "content-type:" header); and

the step (c) comprises the steps of:

c.1) when it determined that the code is text data, parsing the obtained content data

based on description of a display information (Colson, col.1, lines 35-47; col.7, line

47 – col.8, line 15; html browser is used to parse the document having "text/html"

content type); and

c.2) when it determined that the code is not text data, parsing the obtained content data

based on the discriminated content type of the obtained content data (Colson, fig.3;

col.7, line 47 – col.8, line 15; col.9, lines 17-19; if the document audio, sending the

document to audio processor for process).

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 10, wherein the predetermined

information description language is one of HTML (Hypertext Markup Language) and compact

HTML that is a subset of the HTML (Colson, col.1, lines 35-47; col.7, line 47 – col.8, line 15).

8.   **Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Colson in</u>**

view of Gupta as applied to claim 2 above and further in view of **Halahmi,** US 6,684,088 B1,

filed 03/01/2000.

      Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Colson teaches wherein the

information description languages include HTML (Hypertext Markup Language) and XML

(eXtensible Markup Language) (Colson, col.1, lines 35-47; col.7, line 47 – col.8, line 15).

      However, Colson does not explicitly disclose the information description languages include

WML (Wireless Markup Language).

      Halahmi teaches wherein the information description language include HTML (Hypertext

Markup Language) and WML (Wireless Markup Language) (Halahmi, col.8, lines 16-18 and 30-

32; col.9, lines 1-13 and 43-60; and col.11, lines 1-11 and 21-25; portion server parses the header

information to identify different content types, such as text, image, TIFF, HTML, video or WML).

      It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined Halahmi's parsing method into Chu-Carroll to translate any document

type including a WML type into a suitable document as Chu-Carroll disclosed in paragraphs 53, 71

and 140.

      It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have combined Halahmi's WML content type into Colson's HTML and XML, since

the combination would have provide many predetermined content types so that a corresponding

browsers are used to understand, parse, and produce display information.

9.   **Claims 4, 6, 8-9, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over <u>Colson in view of Gupta</u> as applied to claim 1 and 7 above and further in view of <u>Chu-Carroll</u> et al., US 2003/0212686 A1, provisional filed 03/17/2000

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Colson does not explicitly teach wherein the content-type discriminator discriminates a content type of the obtained content data by refereeing to a code arranged at a predetermined location of the obtained content data.

Chu-Carroll teaches searching the plurality of unique codes for a code arranged at a predetermined location of the obtained content data to discriminate the content type of the obtained content data (Chu-Carroll, [0067]-[0068], for XML document type, finding a marker at the first few lines of the document or top-level tag to identify the document type).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chu-Carroll's teaching into Colson to identify a type of any document, such as HTML or XML, since the combination would have provides many techniques are used to identify the document type when either one of the techniques can not verify the document type.

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Colson does not explicitly teaches the content-type discriminator discriminates a content type of the obtained content data by referring to a code arranged at a predetermined location of the obtained content data before referring to a content-type indicating code included in a protocol header of the obtained content data.

Chu-Carroll teaches wherein the content-type discriminator discriminates a content type of the obtained content data by refereeing to a code arranged at a predetermined location of the

obtained content data (Chu-Carroll, [0067]-[0068], for XML document type, finding a marker at the first few lines of the document or top-level tag to identify the document type).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Chu-Carroll's teaching into Colson to identify a type of any document, such as HTML or XML, since the combination would have provides many techniques are used to identify the document type when either one of the techniques can not verify the document type.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Colson teaches wherein the step(b) comprises the steps of:

b.1)   storing a plurality of unique codes each indicating the plurality of predetermined content types (Colson, figures 3-4; col.7, line 47 – col.8, line 15; col.9, lines 11-12, lookup content type in mapping registry);

b.3)   using header of the obtained content data to discriminate the content type of the obtained content data (Colson, fig.4, col.2, lines 4-57; col.8, lines 45-67; col.9, lines 11-12, searching a boundary string follow by a "Content-type:" entry to discriminate the content type of the document).

However, Colson does not explicitly disclose searching the plurality of unique codes for a code arranged at a predetermined location of the obtained content data to discriminate the content type of the obtained content data.

Chu-Carroll teaches searching the plurality of unique codes for a code arranged at a predetermined location of the obtained content data to discriminate the content type of the

obtained content data (Chu-Carroll, [0067]-[0068], for XML document type, finding a marker at

the first few lines of the document or top-level tag to identify the document type).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Chu-Carroll's teaching into Colson to identify a type of

any document, such as HTML or XML, since the combination would have provides many

techniques are used to identify the document type when either one of the techniques can not

verify the document type.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Colson teaches wherein said

discriminating step comprises the steps of:

> b.1)   storing a plurality of unique codes each indicating the plurality of predetermined
>
> content types storing a plurality of unique codes each indicating the plurality of
>
> predetermined content types (Colson, figures 3-4; col.7, line 47 – col.8, line 15;
>
> col.9, lines 11-12, lookup content type in mapping registry);
>
> b.2)   checking a protocol header of the obtained content data to determine whether the
>
> obtained content data is described in a predetermined information description
>
> language (Colson, fig.4, col.2, lines 4-57; col.8, lines 45-67; col.9, lines 11-12,
>
> searching a boundary string follow by a "Content-type:" entry to discriminate the
>
> content type of the document for XML or HTML); and

the step (c) comprises the steps of:

> c.1)   when it is determined that the obtained content data is described in the
>
> predetermined information description language, parsing the obtained

content data based on description or the predetermined information

description language to produce the displaying information (Colson, col.1,

lines 35-47; col.7, line 47 – col.8, line 15; col.9, lines 1-12; plurality of

parsers, such as HTML, XML processors corresponding to respective ones

of plurality of the predetermined content types are used to parse the

document to produce display information); and

c.2)   when it is determined that the obtained content data is not described in the

predetermined information description language, parsing the obtained

content data based on the content data type of obtained content data (Colson,

col.7, line 47 – col.8, line 15; if the document audio, sending the document

to audio processor for process).

However, Colson does not explicitly disclose searching the plurality of unique codes for a

code arranged at a predetermined location of the obtained content data to discriminate the

content type of the obtained content data.

Chu-Carroll teaches searching the plurality of unique codes for a code arranged at a

predetermined location of the obtained content data to discriminate the content type of the

obtained content data (Chu-Carroll, [0067]-[0068], for XML document type, finding a marker at

the first few lines of the document or top-level tag to identify the document type).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Chu-Carroll's teaching into Colson to identify a type of

any document, such as HTML or XML, since the combination would have provides many

techniques are used to identify the document type when either one of the techniques can not

verify the document type.

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent on claim 9, Colson teaches wherein the

predetermined information description language is one of HTML (Hypertext Markup Language)

and compact HTML that is a subset of the HTML (Colson, col.1, lines 35-47; col.7, line 47 – col.8,

line 15).

10.   **Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Colson in view of Gupta as applied to claim 7, and further in view of Gillon et al., US

5,838,927, filed 11/1996.

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 7, Colson teaches wherein the said

discriminating step comprises the steps of:

    b.1)   storing a plurality of content types used in predetermined communication protocol,

             each of the content type indicating the plurality of predetermined content types

             (Colson, figures 3-4; col.7, line 47 – col.8, line 15; col.9, lines 11-12, lookup

             content type in mapping registry);

    b.2)   searching the plurality of content types of the obtained content data to discriminate

             the content type of the obtained content data (Colson, figures 3-4, col.2, lines 4-57;

             col.8, lines 45-67; col.9, lines 11-12, searching a string follow by a "Content-type:"

             entry, such as "text/html", "image/gif" or "audio/wav" to discriminate the content

             type of the document).

However, Colson does not explicitly disclose using file name extension to discriminate the content type of the obtained content data.

Gillon teaches using content type header or file extension to determine data type (Gillon, fig.6, box 604) includes the steps of

a) storing a plurality of file name extensions used in predetermined communication protocol, each of the file name extensions indicating the plurality of predetermined content types (Gillon, col.7, lines 3-9; identifying the content type by matching the file extension of the obtained file with predetermined types. This inherently discloses that the predetermined types must be stored in order matching process); and

b) searching the plurality of file name extensions for a file name extension of the obtained content data to discriminate the content type of the obtained content data (Gillon, col.5, lines 38-67 and col.7, lines 3-9; identifying the content type by matching the file extension of the obtained file with predetermine types. This inherently discloses searching process must be occurred in order matching the file extension of the obtained file with predetermine types).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Gillon's teaching into Colson to identify a type of a document, since the combination would have provided many techniques are used to identify the document type when either one of the techniques can not verify the document type.

Response to Arguments

11.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue that Colson does not teach "displaying the obtained content based on

the displaying information on the display portion of the communication terminal device", since

Colson teaches "depending on the content type, different devices render the content" and

"Colson is unable to display all of the various content type on a single device" (Remarks, page 7,

third paragraph – page 8, first paragraph).

However, the combination of Gupta and Colson teaches such limitation as explained in

the rejection above.

Applicants argue that "Colson fails to disclose Applicants' explicitly recited content-type

discriminator. Chu-Carroll was not included to cure this deficiency" (Remarks, page 8, fourth

paragraph) without providing any reason.

However, examiner respectfully disagrees. As explained in the rejection above, Chu-

Carroll teaches finding a marker at the first few lines of the document or top-level tag to identify

the document is XML document type (Chu-Carroll; [0067]-[0068]).

Conclusion

12.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Gupta, US 2004/0073947 A1, filed 01/01, teaches meta data enhanced television

programming.

Tycast, US 7,047,248 B1, filed 11/97, teaches data processing system and method for archiving and accessing electronic message.

De Val et al., US 6,128,653, filed 03/97, teaches method for communication media commands and media data using HTTP protocol.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V. Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Thu V. Huynh
July 21, 2006